## FORT MONMOUTH ECONOMIC REVITALIZATIONAND PLANNING AUTHORITY

## SOCIAL SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SSAC)

## REPORT ON PUBLIC MEETING, October 2, 2007

The FMERPA Social Services Advisory Committee (SSAC) public meeting took place on October 2, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the new FERMPA offices at 2-12 Corbett Way, Eatontown, N.J.

In attendance were Committee Members: Rose Estephan, Rick Harrison, Lynn Miller. FMERPA Staff Members: Frank Cosentino and Diane Canterbury. Public in attendance: Tom Mahedy, Philip Welch, Connie Fahim, Tara Maffei, James Valle, Virginia Edwards, Beverly Bova Scarano, John Yaecker, Sue Mamchak .........

Committee Members not in attendance: Joe Colfer, Russell Valenti, Ana Dowling.

- 1. Open/Welcome/Introductions Rose Estephan Rose welcomed everyone and acknowledged the public in attendance and told them that their input is welcome as well and that there would be an opportunity to comment and provide input at the end of the meeting.
- 2. Review of Evaluation Process and Meeting Process Rick Harrison Rick recognized some of the NOI submitters in attendance and told them that they are certainly welcome to attend and participate, however they should not feel obligated as attendance is not required and will not affect the evaluation of their NOIs. He further discussed the evaluation process to-date and what it would be going forward, emphasizing that the Advisory Committee would only see the generic NOI summaries and would only evaluate the concepts put forth in the NOIs or the what is being proposed. Rick discussed how the evaluation process would be accomplished and that the capabilities and financial wherewithal of the submitting organizations would not be addressed in the advisory committee but rather be done by FMERPA Staff and the BRAC Attorney. Rick stated that any questions needing clarification on NOIs would be addressed to the individual submitters and that it is not necessary to attend these meeting to answer questions, especially if they want to remain anonymous to the public.

**Public Input:** Tom Mahedy questioned whether a letter had gone out to NOI submitters inviting them to the meeting. Rick Harrison and Rose indicated that it had not and that anyone wanting to be on the meeting notification email list could ask to be on it and receive email notification. Rick stated that the advisory committee would be sending out the information populated in the advisory committee NOI review chart to each NOI submitter for confirmation. Tom also questioned why EDAW was not attending these meetings. Tom also questioned the shut-off of gas to the Pine Brook Housing and reiterated that this housing should be reused but it would deteriorate with no heat in the buildings. Phil Welch asked whether the final evaluation criteria would be made public: Frank

Cosentino and Rick Harrison stated that it would not. Frank and Rick referenced a document, "Utilizing the Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act" and website which would provide guidance as to what would be evaluated and how to best prepare for a successful NOI. The website is: <a href="https://www.nlchp.org">www.nlchp.org</a> the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty. Rick also indicated that it is very likely that as part of the final evaluation process, an application would be sent out asking for much more detail and information on the criteria.

- 3. Review of Prior Meeting Notes Rose Estephan Tom Mahedy noted that the request to notify NOI submitters individually of the Advisory Committees scheduled meetings was not reflected in the meeting report.
- 4. Review of Staff Meeting With Monmouth County Homeless Agencies and Staff Rick Harrison Rick and Rose reported on their participation in a County Staff meeting with all organizations and people involved in homeless assistance. They reported on the information discussed relative to the real needs and priorities in the county which the committee would consider in their evaluation on the NOIs. He reported that they got to see a lot of back-up and source information supporting the public numbers and that much of what they saw could not be made public.

**Public Input:** There were questions regarding the use of the County Consolidated Plan which was explained in detail by Lynn Miller. Tom Mahedy again questioned the county about the numbers being reported to HUD and again Lynn Miller and Virginia Edwards responded, "that the numbers provided to HUD are an accurate reflection of the Continuum of Care study."

- 5. Continue Review of remaining 5 Homeless Assistance NOIs Rick and Diane Canterbury reported on the answers to the questions and action items from the NOI review at the previous meeting indicating that all were resolved. The committee then finished the categorization of the remaining 5 NOIs (chart attached). It was agreed not to distribute copies of the charts to members of the public as it is a work in progress and that public release might cause confusion whereby people could draw the wrong conclusions.
- 6. Discuss pending SSAC Homeless Provider Visits and Schedule Rick Harrison Rick reported on the responses to his letter regarding visits to NOI submitter locations. He indicated that he had heard from seven providers and that he was trying to schedule at least three visits for October 25. He will work with the committee to firm up a schedule.
- 7. Schedule Next Meeting The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 3 PM on October 30.

**Public Input:** Tom Mahedy suggested that the meetings should be held in the evening for the convenience of his own schedule and the members of the public. Rose indicated that the meeting would be scheduled at the convenient time for the committee members and that she would canvass the members as to their preference.

- 8. Public Comment Tom Mahedy again raised the issue of not distributing the working chart to the public and commented that this committee was difficult to deal with and not public friendly and that the public should stay for the next committee meeting of the Commercial Industry Advisory committee to see how nice the business people are treated.
- 9. Adjourn The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:45.